



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,598	06/12/2000	Richard Humpleman	SAM1.0065	7055

7590

12/04/2002

Kenneth L Sherman
Sherman & Sherman
Seventeenth Floor
2029 Century Park East
Los Angeles, CA 90067

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

22

Office Action Summary

Application No. ()

09/592,598

Applicant(s)

HUMPLEMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 June 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because some of the numbers in fig. 10 are unreadable. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it uses "said" in lines 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13 and 15. Correction is required.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 29, line 14-15: Phrase "A proxy 117" should be changed to --A bridge 117--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 14-39 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 14 and 27, page 58 and 61 respectively: Phrase "a communication medium than can be used" should be changed to --a communication medium that can be used--.

Claims 15-26 are dependent on claim 14 and claims 28-39 are dependent on claim 27.

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-4, 6-17, 19-30 and 32-39 of Application No. 09/592598 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-28 of copending Application No. 09/592599 in view of Lea et al ("Lea", US #6032202).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

As per independent claim 1 and claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1; claim 1 of 09/592599 claims the same subject matter as claim 1 and 2 of 09/592598 except for the step of displaying one or more user interfaces each based on one of said one or more user interface descriptions, on one or more devices connected to the network capable of displaying a user interface, for user control of said devices that are currently connected to the network; displaying each user interface further using each reference in the corresponding user interface description to access the associated information in each device; generating the user interface including device data corresponding to each device using the accessed information in each device; and displaying the user interface on said device capable of displaying a user interface. Lea shows that in col. 9, lines 66-67 through col. 10, lines 1-19. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Lea of displaying one or more user interfaces each based on one of said one or more user interface descriptions, on one or more devices connected to the network capable of displaying a user interface, for user control of said devices that are currently connected to the network; displaying each user interface further using each reference in the corresponding user interface description to access the associated information in each device; generating the user interface including device data corresponding to each device using the accessed information in each device; and displaying the user interface on said device capable of displaying a user interface in claim 1 of 09/592599 since it would allow the user to control each of the devices connected to the networks via the user interfaces on the displays.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1; claim 4 of 09/592599 claims the same subject matter as claim 3 of 09/592598

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1; claim 5 of 09/592599 claims the same subject matter as claim 4 of 09/592598

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1; claim 1 of 09/592599 claims the same subject matter as claim 6 of 09/592598 except for the step of connecting at least one client device to the network capable of displaying a user interface; and displaying a user interface on the client device using the references in a user interface description, for controlling devices that are currently connected to the network. Lea shows that in col. 24, lines 60-67 through col. 25, lines 11-22; in this example, television is the client device. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Lea of connecting at least one client device to the network capable of displaying a user interface; and displaying a user interface on the client device using the references in a user interface description, for controlling devices that are currently connected to the network in claim 1 of 09/592599 since it would allow the user to control all the devices connected to the network via user interfaces on the screen.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1; claim 1 of 09/592599 claims the same subject matter as claim 7 of 09/592598 except for the step of said at least one device is capable of displaying a user interface, and further comprising the steps of: displaying a user interface on said at least one device using the references in the user interface description, for controlling devices that are currently connected to the network Lea shows that in col. 24, lines 60-67 through col. 25, lines 11-22. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use

Art Unit: 2174

the teaching from Lea of said at least one device is capable of displaying a user interface, and further comprising the steps of: displaying a user interface on said at least one device using the references in the user interface description, for controlling devices that are currently connected to the network in claim 1 of 09/592599 since it would allow the user to control all the devices connected to the network via user interfaces on the screen.

As per claims 8-11, which are dependent on claim 1, claims 12 and 13, which are dependent on claim 11 and independent claim 14; claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of 09/592599 claims the same subject matter as claims 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of 09/592598, respectively.

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 4; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 6; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 7; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 8; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 9; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 10; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 11; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 24, it is a similar scope to claim 12; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 24, it is a similar scope to claim 13; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per independent claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 14; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 15; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 16; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 17; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 32, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 19; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 20; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 34, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 21; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 35, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 22; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 36, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 23; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 37, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 24; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 38, which is dependent on claim 37, it is a similar scope to claim 25; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 37, it is a similar scope to claim 26; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claims 5, 18 and 31 of Application No. 09/592598 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 10 and 20 of copending Application No. 09/592599 in view of Lea et al ("Lea", US #6032202) as applied to claims 1, 10 and 20 and further in view of Venkatraman et al ("Venkatraman", US #5956487).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1; claim 1 of 09/592599 claims the same subject matter as claim 5 of 09/592598 except for the step of displaying the user interface further comprises the steps of displaying the user interface on a browser on said device capable of

Art Unit: 2174

displaying a user interface. Venkatraman discloses that in fig. 1A, fig. 2, and col. 3, lines 5-61, col. 5, lines 29-64. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Venkatraman of the step of displaying the user interface further comprises the steps of displaying the user interface on a browser on said device capable of displaying a user interface since the browser would allow the devices to interface with Internet, provided by service providers, via HTTP protocol.

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 5; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 31, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 18; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1-2, 6-15, 19-28 and 32-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lea et al (“Lea”, US #6032202).

As per independent claim 1, Lea teaches a method for providing a user interface for controlling devices that are currently connected to a network, the method comprising the steps of, for one or more of said devices:

obtaining information from devices currently connected to the network, said information including device information (col. 3, lines 5-12);

generating a user interface description in each of said one or more devices based at least on the obtained information, the user interface description in each device including at least one reference associated with the device information of each of said devices currently connected to the network (col. 2, lines 57-67); and

displaying one or more user interfaces each based on one of said one or more user interface descriptions, on one or more devices connected to the network capable of displaying a user interface, for user control of said devices that are currently connected to the network (col. 9, lines 66-67 through col. 10, lines 1-19).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches the step of displaying each user interface further includes the steps of:

using each reference in the corresponding user interface description to access the associated information in each device; generating the user interface including device data corresponding to each device using the accessed information in each device; and displaying the user interface on said device capable of displaying a user interface (col. 9, lines 66-67 through col. 10, lines 1-19 and col. 17, lines 18-27).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches further comprising the steps of:

connecting at least one client device to the network capable of displaying a user interface; and displaying a user interface on the client device using the references in a user interface description, for controlling devices that are currently connected to the network (col. 24, lines 60-67 through col. 25, lines 11-22; in this example, television is the client device).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches said at least one device is capable of displaying a user interface, and further comprising the steps of: displaying a user interface on said at least one device using the references in the user interface description, for controlling devices that are currently connected to the network (col. 24, lines 60-67 through col. 25, lines 11-22).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches the step of generating a user interface description further includes the steps of generating each user interface description such that the reference in that user interface description provides access to at least the information in each corresponding device (col. 17, lines 18-27).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, wherein the step of generating a user interface description further includes the steps of generating each user interface description such that the user interface description further includes device data corresponding to each device

Art Unit: 2174

based on the information obtained from each device (col. 9, lines 54-67 through col. 10, lines 1-19).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches the device information in each device includes device identification information (col. 7, lines 20-27).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches the device information in each device includes a user control interface description for user interaction with the device (col. 6, lines 40-48).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Lea teaches the step of generating a user interface description further includes the steps of generating each user interface description such that each reference in that user interface description is to at least the user control interface description in each corresponding device (col. 2, lines 57-67 through col. 3, lines 1-4, and col. 6, lines 40-48).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, Lea teaches the step of generating a user interface description further includes the steps of generating each user interface description wherein that user interface description further includes device data corresponding to each device based on the information obtained from each device, the device data providing reference to the user control interface description in each device (col. 6, lines 58-67 through col. 7, lines 1-9).

As per independent claim 14, Lea teaches a network system for performing a service, comprising:

a physical layer, wherein the physical layer provides a communication medium that can be used by devices to communicate with each other (col. 7, lines 62-67; *IEEE 1394 serial communication bus*);

one or more devices connected to the physical layer (col. 7, lines 62-67), each device storing information including device information (col. 6, lines 40-48);

an agent in each of one or more devices, adapted for:

obtaining information from devices currently connected to the network, said information including device information (col. 3, lines 5-12);

generating a user interface description in each of said one or more devices based at least on the obtained information, the user interface description in each device including at least one reference associated with the device information of each of said devices currently connected to the network (col. 2, lines 57-67); and

displaying one or more user interfaces each based on one of said one or more user interface descriptions, on one or more devices connected to the network capable of displaying a user interface, for user control of said devices that are currently connected to the network (col. 9, lines 66-67 through col. 10, lines 1-19).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 6; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 7; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 8; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 9; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 10; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 11; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 24, it is a similar scope to claim 12; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 24, it is a similar scope to claim 13; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per independent claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 14; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 15; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 32, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 19; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 20; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 34, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 21; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 35, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 22; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 36, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 23; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 37, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 24; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 38, which is dependent on claim 37, it is a similar scope to claim 25; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 37, it is a similar scope to claim 26; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 3-5, 16-18 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lea in view of Venkatraman et al ("Venkatraman", US #5956487).

As per claims 3, 4 and 5, which are all dependent on claim 1, Lea does not disclose the step of generating a user interface description further comprises the steps of: associating a hyper-text link with the device information of each of said devices currently connected to the network, the information in each device comprises an HTML page contained in that device, and the step of displaying the user interface further comprises the steps of displaying the user interface on a browser on said device capable of displaying a user interface. Venkatraman discloses that in fig. 1A, fig. 2, and col. 3, lines 5-61, col. 5, lines 29-64. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Venkatraman of associating a hyper-text link with the device information of each of said devices currently connected to the network, the information in each device comprises an HTML page contained in that device, and the step of displaying the user interface further comprises the steps of displaying the user interface on a browser on said device capable of displaying a user interface in Lea's method since HTML pages and the browser would allow the devices to interface with Internet, from service providers, via HTTP protocol

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 4; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 5; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 16; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 17; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 31, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 18; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Pat. 6044403 to Gerszberg, Irwin et al. discloses network server platform for internet, JAVA server and video application server.

US Pat. 6337899 to Alcendor, Tommy et al. discloses speaker verification for authorizing updates to user subscription service received by internet service provider (ISP) using an intelligent peripheral (IP) in an advanced intelligent network (AIN).

US Pat. 6374293 to Dev, Roger H. et al. discloses network management system using model-based intelligence.

US Pat. 6480889 to Saito, Takeshi et al. discloses scheme for managing nodes connected to a home network according to their physical locations.

US Pat. 6157645 to Shobatake, Yasuro discloses ATM communication system and ATM communication method.

Art Unit: 2174

US Pat 6169725 to Gibbs, Simon J. et al. discloses apparatus and method for restoration of internal connections in a home audio/video system.

Inquires

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kistine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
November 25, 2002

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100